APPENDIX E – Rating and Ranking Criteria

Visual Resources Criteria

The capability and suitability ratings used for the visual category were based on a visual management methodology and descriptions taken from *National Forest Landscape Management Volume 2*, Chapter 1, "The Visual Management System", Agricultural Handbook Number 462, prepared by the U. S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture. In accordance with the methodology, each tract was assigned a rating based on two components, *variety classes* and *sensitivity levels*.

Capability Criteria *Variety classes* are obtained by classifying the landscape into different degrees of variety. Variety classification is used to determine those landscapes which are most important and those which are of lesser value from the standpoint of scenic quality.

Variety classification is based on the premise that while all landscapes have some value, *those with the most variety or diversity have the greatest potential for high scenic value*. There are three variety classes that identify the scenic quality of the natural landscape:

Class A —Distinctive. Those areas where features of landform, vegetative patterns, water forms, and rock formations are of unusual or outstanding visual quality and not common in the character type.

Class B —Common. Those areas where features contain variety in form, line, color, and texture or combinations thereof, but which tend to be common throughout the character type and are not outstanding in visual quality.

Class C —Minimal. Those area where features have little change in form, line, color, or texture. Includes all areas not classified as A and B.

The capability ratings of excellent, good, fair, and poor are based on these classifications and the perceived level of human disturbance to the site which interfered with the natural viewscape.

Excellent (1) — A tract rated excellent for visual quality would have exceptionally varied and or unique landscape that should be preserved in its current state. It would be rated "Distinctive" for variety. Only ecological changes should be allowed on a tract rated excellent. Management activities, except for very low visual-impact recreation facilities should be prohibited.

Good (2) —A tract rated good for visual quality would contain a varied, high-quality visual aspect, but no unique or distinctive features. Only slight evidence of human influence on the viewscape should be apparent. It would be rated "Common" for variety. Some management activity would be appropriate on such a tract, but care should be given to maintain or improve the integrity of the existing viewscape.

Fair (3) —A tract rated fair for visual quality shows clear evidence of human activity and/or little variety or interesting features in the original viewscape. Sites may contain roads, signs, and buildings, or disturbed vegetation. It would be rated "Minimal" under variety. Such a tract could be enhanced or rehabilitated to improve visual harmony with the surrounding natural viewscape, but will continue to support some development and should be managed to minimize further visual degradation.

Poor (4) —A tract rated poor may be highly disturbed by human activity, such as a mining site or a clear cut, or may be visually undisturbed. It would be rated minimal or would be unrated on the variety scale. These tracts would require much enhancement or rehabilitation to restore visual quality.

Suitability Criteria Suitability is based on the site sensitivity. Sensitivity levels are a measure of concern for the scenic quality of the TVA land, viewed from the reservoir and from the land. Sensitivity levels are determined for land areas viewed 1) from the reservoir, 2) from primary travel routes, and 3) from secondary travel routes. In this way, some degree of site sensitivity was established for the entire land base.

Three sensitivity levels are employed, each identifying a different level of user concern for the visual environment.
Level 1 —Includes all areas seen from the reservoir where there is major concern for the scenic qualities.
Level 2 —Includes all areas seen from primary travel routes and use areas where there is major concern for scenic qualities.
Level 3 —Includes all areas seen from secondary travel routes and use areas. Level 3 does not include any areas seen from the reservoir or primary routes.

NATURAL AREA CRITERIA FOR LAND USE PLANS

Small Wild Areas are sites with exceptional natural , scenic, or aesthetic qualities, which are suitable for low-impact public use. (Walking, hiking, interpretive, handicapped.) Examples include concentrations of wildflowers, high bluffs with long views, geologic feature (not caves), waterfalls or dripping rock ledges, mature or “undisturbed” forests. Should have access by public road.

Ecological Study Areas consist of sites judged suitable for ecological research or environmental education. Such areas typically contain plant or animal populations of scientific interest or are usually located near an educational institution that will use the area. Should have potential benefit to the local educational community.

Habitat Protection Areas are established to protect populations of species that have been identified as threatened or endangered by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service or that are rare to the State in which they occur. Unusual of exemplary biological communities or unique geological features also receive protection in this category. There areas typically require buffer zones. (Examples are bat caves, rare plant/animal habitat).

Wildlife Observation Areas are sites that have concentrations of viewable wildlife - shorebirds, songbirds, white-tailed deer, migratory hawks or monarch butterflies, turkey, raccoons, etc. (Draw down zones, dam reservations, urban wetlands, bluffs.) Can be seasonal. Need public access to site.

CRITERIA FOR CONSERVATION PARTNERSHIP

Each area proposed for Zone 8 was reviewed by boat for compatibility with the criteria listed below. Parcel descriptions were drafted and included in the land plan describing vegetation, erosion, slope, etc.

Criteria Used to Allocate Lands to Zone 8

- Only those areas that were previously classified as Zone 4 in the draft EIS were considered for allocation to Zone 8.
- The boundary separating TVA land from private land must be within 50 feet of the 895-foot contour for at least 100 linear feet along the shoreline.
- The water depth must be at least 5 feet at normal summer pool.
- The slope of the shoreline in areas designated Zone 8 must be less than 35 % slope (32 degrees).
- An area at the back of a cove must not be allocated to Zone 8 unless the area is part of a larger parcel such that water-use facilities can be situated at a more suitable location.

Criteria to be Used to Evaluate 26a Applications for Community Facilities in Zone 8

TVA will accept Section 26a applications for community docks facilities. These applications will be accepted subject to the conditions described below.

- No more than one community facility will be allowed in a discrete contiguous Zone 8 parcel, except for parcels 26-1, 34-1, 40-3, 57-2, 71-1, and 73-2. On these parcels, TVA may consider an additional community facility depending on suitability of the proposed facility with respect to the shoreline.
- A Section 26a application for a community facility in a particular stretch of the shoreline in Zone 8 may be considered only if all property owners behind that discrete stretch grant TVA a conservation easement to the shoreline strip adjoining TVA land. The width of the shoreline strip granted to TVA when added to the width of TVA's adjoining land must be no less than 100 feet. The 100-foot depth is to be counted from the 895-foot contour line.
- Community facilities will be no larger than 2,000 square feet in area and must be of a type described in the Tims Ford Reservoir Land Management and Disposition Plan, Zone 8 definition.
- Community facilities that exceed the 1,000 square foot footprint are subject to the harbor limit requirements for commercial marinas.
- Community facilities will not be allowed in those Zone 8 areas where sensitive resources are identified.
- The number of slips in a community facility shall not exceed the number of lots adjacent to the 1,500-foot stretch of the shoreline for which a Section 26a permit is being issued. Launching ramps at a community facility would be considered only if TVA determines that the operation of the ramp would not adversely impact water quality.

- When a discrete stretch of land in Zone 8 fronts more than one lot, the 26a permit application for a community facility must be submitted on behalf of all lot owners in that 1,500-foot stretch of the shoreline. In the event that only one lot is adjacent to the discrete stretch of land in Zone 8, the community dock will be restricted to a maximum footprint of 1000 square feet. Should lots be subdivided and sold, TVA may reconsider a revised application for expanded facilities, not to exceed a maximum size of 2,000 square feet.

- The 26a application for a community facility must be accompanied by a vegetation management plan. The vegetation management plan, once approved by TVA, will be implemented by the lot owners along the entire width of the 100-foot wide (or greater) shoreline including both the TVA fee strip as well as the adjacent strip over which an easement has been granted to TVA.

Requests would be submitted to TVA by developers prior to lot sales or by state chartered homeowners associations (HOA). The developer or HOA would design the facility to provide maximum benefit to the environment and their neighborhood. That would help establish adequate land base (green space) for the community area. Everyone behind Zone 8 would be granted access to the community facility but would not be guaranteed slips, as many sites are not suitable for large multiple-slip facilities.

Land Use Specialists will review the area and work with the adjacent property owners to determine what actions are necessary within the easement area to establish a wider shoreline buffer. This could include, but would not be limited to, recommendations for riprap if there is sufficient erosion, native tree/shrub plantings, and in general restoring the area to a more natural setting.

RECREATION CAPABILITY/SUITABILITY CRITERIA

Zones	Land Base	Forest-ation	Shoreline	Harbor Area	Reservoir Drawdown	Location	Road Access	Outside Interest	Land Use	Aesthetics	Land Ownership
ZONES 3, 4, 6, and 7	Not Applicable (NA)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	High rating: visual appeal very pleasing	High rating: >5 miles public land ownership
River Corridors	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Medium rating: visual appeal slight	Medium rating: 3-5 miles of uninterrupted public land
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Low rating: visual appeal very poor	Low rating: < 3 miles public land ownership
ZONE 4	High rating: > 5 acres; < 15% slope	NA	High rating: easy access; use capability diverse	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	High rating: adjoining land use compatible	NA	NA
Informal Recreation (Recreation pursuits on undeveloped land)	Medium rating: 2-5 acres; 15-20% slope	NA	Medium rating: fair access; use capability limited	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Medium rating: adjoining land use questionable	NA	NA
	Low rating: < 5 acres; > 20% slope	NA	Low rating: poor access and use capability	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Low rating: adjoining land use detracts	NA	NA
ZONE 6	High rating: >20 acres; 1-10% slope	High rating: >50% cover	High rating: <15% slope underwater; no water hazards	NA	High rating: minimal visual aesthetic impact	High rating: major area of need	High rating: road to the site	High rating: Use requested	NA	NA	NA
Public Parks (Local, state, or federal parks)	Med. rating: 10-20 acres; 10-15% slope	Med. rating: 25-50% cover	Med. rating: 15-20% slope underwater; correctable hazards	NA	Med. rating: moderate visual aesthetic impact	Med. rating: may be needed	Med. rating: road within½ mile	Med. rating: Potential exists	NA	NA	NA
	Low rating: <5 acres; >15% slope	Low rating: < 25% cover	Low rating: > 20% slope underwater; prohibitive hazards	NA	Low rating: major visual aesthetic impact	Low rating: duplicates or is questionable	Low rating: road > ½ mile away	Low rating: Unlikely	NA	NA	NA
	High rating: >10 acres; 1-5% slope	High rating: <25% cover	High rating: <15% slope underwater; no water hazards	High rating: >10 acres; wind-protected	High rating: minimal visual aesthetic impact	High rating: major area of need	High rating: road to the site	High rating: Use requested	NA	NA	NA
Commer-cial (Camp-	Med. rating: 5-10 acres;	Med. rating:	Med. rating: 15-20% slope	Med. rating: 5-10 acres;	Med. rating: moderate	Med. rating: may be	Med. rating: road within½	Med. rating: Potential	NA	NA	NA

Zones	Land Base	Forest-ation	Shoreline	Harbor Area	Reservoir Drawdown	Location	Road Access	Outside Interest	Land Use	Aesthetics	Land Ownership
grounds, marinas, and resorts)	5-10% slope	25-50% cover	underwater; correctable hazards	partial protection	visual aesthetic impact	needed	mile	exists			
	Low rating: minimum 5 acres; >10% slope	Low rating: > 50% cover	Low: > 20% slope under-water; pro-hibitive haz.	Low rating: < 5 acres; no natural protection	Low rating: major visual aesthetic impact	Low rating: duplicates or is questionable	Low rating: road > ½ mile away	Low rating: Unlikely	NA	NA	NA
Water Access (Lake or river access sites)	High rating: >3 acres	NA	High rating: <15% slope underwater; no water hazards	NA	NA	High rating: major area of need	High rating: road to the site	High rating: Use requested	NA	NA	NA
	Med. rating: 1-3 acres	NA	Med. rating: 15-20% slope underwater; correctable hazards	NA	NA	Med. rating: may be needed	Med. rating: road within½ mile	Med. rating: Potential exists	NA	NA	NA
	Low rating: <1 acre	NA	Low rating: > 20% slope underwater; prohibitive hazards	NA	NA	Low rating: duplicates or is questionable	Low rating: road > ½ mile away	Low rating: Unlikely	NA	NA	NA

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA

Capability	Land Base	Land Slope	Shape	Height Above Water	Flooding	Barge Accessibility	Miles to Major State or Federal Highway	Miles To Railroad	Availability of Utilities	Road Access
Industrial Site	High rating: over 100 acres; Medium rating: 25 to 100 acres; Low rating: less than 25 acres	High rating: 1 to 5%; Medium rating: 5 to 15%; Low rating: greater than 15%	High rating: fairly rectangular; Medium rating: square; Low rating: irregular	High rating: less than 20 feet; Medium rating: 20 to 40 feet; Low rating: greater than 40 feet	High rating: majority above structure profile; Medium rating: 50% above structure profile; Low rating: majority below structure profile	High rating: minor or no dredging required; Medium rating: some dredging required; Low rating: major dredging required or no barge available	High rating: less than 2; Medium rating: 2 to 5; Low rating: more than 5	High rating: less than 1; Medium rating: 1 to 2; Low rating: more than 2	High rating: all utilities available; Medium rating: some utilities available; Low rating: no utilities available	High rating: road to the site; Medium rating: road within ½ mi. of site; Low rating: road greater than ½ mi. of site
Industrial Access	High rating: more than 10 acres; Medium rating: 5 to 10 acres; Low rating: minimum of 5 acres	High rating: 1 to 5%; Medium rating: 5 to 15%; Low rating: greater than 15%	High rating: long, linear rectangle; Medium rating: short, linear rectangle; Low rating: short and irregular	High rating: less than 20 feet; Medium rating: 20 to 40 feet; Low rating: greater than 40 feet	High rating: majority above structure profile; Medium rating: 50% above structure profile; Low rating: majority below structure profile	High rating: minor or no dredging required; Medium rating: some dredging required; Low rating: major dredging required or no barge available	High rating: less than 2; Medium rating: 2 to 5; Low rating: more than 5	High rating: less than 1; Medium rating: 1 to 2; Low rating: more than 2	High rating: all utilities available; Medium rating: some utilities available; Low rating: no utilities available	High rating: road to the site Medium rating: road within ½ mi. of site; Low rating: road greater than ½ mi. of site

CRITERIA FOR NATURAL RESOURCE STEWARDSHIP

Overland Access	Ecological Diversity	Habitat Management	Cost Recovery	Compatibility of Adjacent Land Use	Multiple Use Potential	Intensity of Current Use	Natural Resources Partnerships
Existing Road Network	> 5 Ecological Communities or Successional Stages	Easily Managed	High	Adjacent Land Use Would Have No Effect on Management Decisions	3 To 5 Potential Uses	N/A	N/A
Overland Access Possible	3 To 5 Ecological Communities or Successional Stages	Could Be Managed	Medium	Adjacent Land Use Could Preclude Some Management Options	1 to 3 Potential Uses	N/A	N/A
Overland Access Unavailable	1 To 3 Ecological Communities or Successional Stages	Difficult to Manage	Low	Adjacent Land Use Could Prevent Resource Management/Utilization	Single Use Potential	N/A	N/A
Existing Road Network	N/A	N/A	High	Adjacent Land Use Would Have No Effect on Management Decisions	3 To 5 Potential Uses	Year Round Use	N/A
Overland Access Possible	N/A	N/A	Medium	Adjacent Land Use Could Preclude Some Management Options	1 To 3 Potential Uses	2 Or 3 Season Use	N/A
Overland Access Unavailable	N/A	N/A	Low	Adjacent Land Use Could Prevent Resource Management/Utilization	Single Use Potential	< 2 Season Use	N/A
Existing Road Network	N/A	Easily Managed	High	Adjacent Land Use Would Have No Effect on Management Decisions	3 To 5 Potential Uses	N/A	2 or More Potential Partners or 2 or More Partnerships In Place
Overland Access Possible	N/A	Could Be Managed	Medium	Adjacent Land Use Could Preclude Some Management Options Adjacent Land Use	1 To 3 Potential Uses	N/A	1 or 2 Potential Partners or 1 or 2 Partnerships In Place
Overland Access Unavailable	N/A	Difficult To Manage	Low	Could Prevent Resource Management/Utilization	Single Use Potential	N/A	No Potential for Partnerships and No Partnerships in Place
> $5000	N/A	> 2 Prior Investors	High	N/A	N/A	N/A	2 or More Partners Have Invested
$0 to $5000	N/A	1 To 2 Prior Investors	Medium	N/A	N/A	N/A	1 To 2 Partners Have Invested
No Prior Investment	N/A	No Prior Investors	Low	N/A	N/A	N/A	No Prior Investments